



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,825	09/30/2003	Reiner Hammerich	09700.0046-00	3059
60668	7590	09/19/2008	EXAMINER	
SAP / FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP			DAO, THUY CHAN	
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			2192	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/19/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/676,825	HAMMERICH ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Thuy Dao	2192

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,11,12 and 21-25.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Tuan Q. Dam/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

As an initial matter, the examiner notes that proposed amendments in dependent claim 24 has not been entered yet because said amendments require further consideration and/or search.

Limitations at issue "receiving a meta-language description of a computer program, the meta- language description comprising a definition module and an implementation module, the implementation module defining a first class to be implemented by the program and the definition module defining a first interface associated with the class" (e.g., claim 1, lines 3-6 and Remarks, pp. 12-14).

The examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicants' assertions.

At the outset, the Applicants acknowledged,

"...However, as discussed above, Walker converts between data representations ... But paragraph 21 clearly states, 'Next, the operation of the invention will be shown within the context of converting the book store data set between JAVA and XML descriptors' " (Remarks, page 13, first paragraph).

That is to say, Walker teaches:

converting a JAVA class into an XML representation ([0010], FIG. 4 and related text); and

converting an XML document to a JAVA class representation ([0011], FIG. 5 and related text), wherein said converting the XML document to the JAVA class representation fully reads on the instant claim limitations.

As set forth in the previous Office action mailed June 18, 2008, Walker explicitly teaches a method for validating programs, the method comprising:

receiving a meta-language description of a computer program (e.g., [0022], receiving an XML description/representation of a Java class "BookStore", which is a "book store" computer program),

the meta-language description comprising a implementation module, the implementation module defining a first class to be implemented by the program (e.g., [0023] and [0021], the XML "Bookstore" description/representation defines the Java class "BookStore" of the "book store" computer program) and

an definition module, the definition module defining a first interface associated with the class (e.g., FIG. 4, block 410 --> block 415 "Determine if XmlReaderWriter Interface Implemented?" --> block 420 "Implemented"/YES: in said XML description/representation, said class "BookStore" associated with the interface "XmlReaderWriter").

Accordingly, Applicants' assertions are not persuasive.

The examiner respectfully maintains the 35 USC 102 rejection over claims 1-2, 11-12, and 21-25.